PUBLIC EDUCATION INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE (PEITC)
Subcommittee of
IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING

Approved Minutes
April 8, 2002
700 West State Street, West Conference Room, Boise

<u>**Attendance:**</u>

Black, Pete	McGrath, Deb
Breithaupt, David	Mikelson, Ray
Chandler, Vickie - not present	Mincer, Rich
Ganske, Karen	Powers, Stephanie
Gibson, Christopher	Reynolds, Vikki
Hawkins, Dan	Seiler, Ron
Johnson, Dale representing Paula Conley	Shinn, Jeff (needs ICTL agenda and book)
Krun, Lynda	Szofran, Nancy
Leaf, Bill, PEITC Chair	Thornsberry, Dale
Mauer, Carolyn - not present	Wilson, Dawn

The Public Education Information Technology Committee meeting (PEITC) meeting began at 9:08 am. PEITC Chair, Bill Leaf asked each guest and member to introduce themselves.

<u>Gates Grant Report</u> - Vickie Reynolds gave a brief update on the Gates Grant. She presented a report from the Idaho Administrator Leadership with Technology Academy (IALTA) on the enrollment for 2001-2002 school year and schedule for 2002-2003. The Gates Grant is a three-year grant, two years of training and the third year for evaluation and assessment. This grant will provide financial support to the districts to help cover training costs, training of 250 superintendents and principals this year and next, totaling 500 participants.

Training was offered in six regions with a total of 14 sessions. The training included two days in September and January, and one day in April for a total of five days (40 hours of instruction). The last day of training will be the held the 4th week of April 2002.

The Standards implementation and assessment needs will drive the curriculum. The curriculum work was created with input from a number of practicing administrators and has been modified based on the needs and responses of the participants. An outline of the curriculum schedule was reviewed. Participants will fill out an online evaluation form on the effectiveness of training. This project has had ongoing evaluation by the trainers. Following the training, onsite visitation will be conducted to ascertain the effectiveness of the training. Evaluation and analysis reports will be presented to the ICTL committee or the K12 sub committee. A report was presented to the Gates Foundation in November and will continue each year of the grant. The official financial and narrative report was e-mailed to the Foundation in February.

<u>Providing Technology Access to Students with Disabilities</u> - Ron Seiler, Director of the Idaho Assistive Technology Project, University of Idaho: This is a 10 year project funded by the U.S. Department of Education. Educational technology improves learning for all students. For

students with disabilities, assistive technology plays a more critical role in improving learning outcomes and the integration of students with disabilities into the regular curriculum.

The Federal laws that govern a public school's obligation to provide accessible technology for individuals with disabilities all seek to ensure that an individual's disability does not prevent him or her from participating in educational school programs. A public school, or any other recipient of Federal financial assistance, should look to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (section 504), 29 U.S.C.-794, with implementing regulations at 34 CFR Part 104. As a public entity, the responsibilities of a school are also governed by Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), 42 U.S. C. 120101, with implementing regulations at 28 CFR Part 35. In addition, the individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), which was re-authorized on June 4, 1997 as Public Law No. 105-17, can be found starting at page 37 of Volume III of the Statues at Large applies to States, Public School districts, and other instrumentalities of the State responsible for educating students with disabilities.

Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998 requires when federal departments and agencies procure, develop, use, maintain, or upgrade technology, it will be accessible to individuals with disabilities, and comply with Section 508 standards developed by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board), unless doing so would pose an undue burden on the federal department or agency. The following are three recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Ensure Idaho public schools are providing students with disabilities with accessible technology. (It was suggested the ICTL handle this recommendation.)

Recommendation 2: Collaborate with Colleges of Education in the preparation and in-service training of teachers in order to increase the integration of accessible technology into instructional practices. (It was suggested the Higher Education Information Technology Committee (HEITC) handle this recommendation.)

Recommendation 3: Evaluate and publicize the impact of accessible technology on the academic achievement of students with disabilities. (It was suggested State Department of Education develop this recommendation.)

The ICTL has responsibility for the integration and use of technology in Idaho's public schools, and as such, can play a leadership role in addressing the technology-related needs of students with disabilities. As the ICTL is in the process of reviewing and revising *Connections: A Statewide Plan for Technology in Idaho Public Schools*, should include in their plan assistive technology for individuals with disabilities. Strategies on the recommendations will be discussed through e-mail, and presented to the ICTL at the May 9th meeting.

Technology Grant Updates - Dawn Wilson: Goals 2000, Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF), Elementary and Secondary Elementary Act (ESEA), Erate, State Technology Plan, Phase 1 and 2, Teacher Technology Competency, Course of Study and Assessment Guides)

Goals 2000-1999 funds have been spent; final reports were due December 3, 2001. These reports have been posted on the following URL: http://www.sde.state.id.us/bots/goals2000.htm.

District funds have until September 30, 2002 to spend their year 2000 funds; final reports are due December 3, 2002.

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (TLCF) - 1999 TLCF funds have been spent; final reports were due in January 2002. The districts have until Sept. 30, 2002 to spend their funds; final reports will be due January 2003.

Elementary and Secondary Elementary Act (ESEA) – Ed Tech – Enhancing Education Through Technology Act, section D of the ESEA Grant – FY 2002 Ed Tech funds will become available around mid July-October and will remain available for obligation by a State and its sub-grantees until September 30, 2004.

The primary goal of the Ed Tech program is to improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools. It is also designed to assist every student - regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability - in becoming technologically literate by the end of eighth grade, and to encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with professional development and curriculum development to promote research-based instructional methods that can be widely replicated.

The Ed Tech Program consolidates the current TLCF program and the Technology Innovative Challenge Grant Program into a single State formula grant program. Under the Ed Tech Program, the Unites States Department of Education (USDOE) will provide grants to State educational agencies (SEAs) based on their proportionate share of funding under Part A of Title I. The department anticipates Idaho's Ed Tech sub-grant allotment will be approximately $3 million; of that $3 million, 50% must be distributed on a formula basis to Title I eligible local educational agencies (LEAs) and the other 50% competitively to Title I eligible local entities. In other words, both the formula and competitive portions will be awarded to LEAs based upon their identified "high-need" status, as it relates to their reduced lunch count, poverty level, and rural location.

E-Rate was discussed and updated. In the last four years, Idaho has received $4,475,358.43.

Teacher Technology Competency - The Professional Standards Commission (PSC) will go before the Idaho State Board of Education at their June meeting with a motion to move teacher technology competency to certification. The motion requests that the action be retroactive to June of 1997, and the certificated personnel would only need to pass one of the assessments once.

A (not for distribution) draft of the Phase 1 and 2 was handed out and reviewed. This draft will require input before being finalized and taken to the ICTL May 9th meeting. Phase I (inventory) has very few changes. Future plans include streamlining the reporting process by making Phase 1 and 2 available online. Changes or suggestions need to be sent to Dawn Wilson. Note: The

ICTL goals have not changed, but the rubric will change to incorporate Section 508 – assistive technology for disabled individuals.

Suggestions and/or concerns:
Need input from Technology Directors/Coordinators.
Add questions to incorporate Technology Use Plans.
Elaborate, "Has technology increased student performance?"
Put original goals online for reference purposes.
Is there a need to request data that is no longer relative?
Make sure what you are asking dovetails with a district's needs, plans, and needs assessments.
Incorporate questions to obtain student achievement data.

A draft automated technology plan developer (template) was reviewed. Timeline for development and implementation of the automated Phase 1 and 2 should be up and running by September 2003. It was suggested to have training for districts before implementation of the online template.

Student Technology Standards – Legislation states all students must be technology literate by eighth grade. The term "technology literate" needs to be defined. A suggestion was made that the State should look at adopting the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) student standards. The basic ISTE student standards reviewed are: basic operations and concepts, social, ethical, and human issues, technology productivity, communications, research, and problem-solving and decision-making tools.

Suggestions made: develop indicators as to the meaning of the student standards, include some basic help for measurement, give examples of how standards can be met, and create a check off list so teachers can check each standard the student has met.

It was noted ISTE standards would be reviewed, defined with examples, and presented to the ICTL in the fall. If you have any suggestions on how districts can meet the standards, please send them to Dawn Wilson. ICTL will be informed of the new Federal guidelines for eighth graders, and the department will be working towards finalizing the standards by fall.

Teacher Training Requirements - Dawn Wilson: It was suggested and discussed that teacher training requirements be removed. Discussion continued and suggestions were made to keep teacher-training requirements, but change the percentage and intent language for flexibility.

Motion #1: Karen Ganske motioned to require the equivalent to 25% of the ICTL Grant monies received by the districts be spent on teacher training, using any funding sources. Ray Mikelson seconded the motion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously. One vote abstained - Pete Black.

Motion #1a: Teacher Training Requirements - Karen Ganske motioned to add to the original motion: professional development will be decided by the district on how to spend the teacher training funds using vendors, universities, or internal sources. Ray Mikelson seconded the motion. Vote was taken passed unanimously, one abstained - Pete Black.

PUBLIC EDUCATION INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE (PEITC)
Subcommittee of
IDAHO COUNCIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING

<u>Idaho Student Information Management System (ISIMS)</u> - Rich Mincer: The State Superintendent requested an addition $2 million for software for the districts, but was not funded.

The J.A. and Kathryn Albertson Foundation granted $3.5 million to:

Step 1: Institute ISIMS in 15 school districts. Of those 15 districts, 13 will begin the project now and 2 districts will wait until next year. Mark Kuskie, Sherwan Merritt, and another individual will be working with NCS Pearson to implement SASIxp software at these districts.

Step 2: The department will assist these districts with a curriculum management part that will help with standards implementation and reporting.

Part 3: The department is working with the State purchasing to make available the best price to any district wanting to participate.

<u>Legislative Intent Language</u> - $10.4 million was reduced to $8.4 million, which includes funding $300,000 for LiLI, $173,000 for ICTL administration, and $150,000 to help match the Gates Grant. A new distribution list of the remaining funds disseminated to districts was reviewed.

The State Board is moving ahead with their agreement with Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) to do statewide testing. The state has reached a compliance agreement with the federal government to work with NWEA to develop testing that will satisfy Title 1 needs statewide.

Moving forward with online testing, the department needs to look at alternative technologies, rather than using the computers that have been put in the classroom by the ICTL. NWEA stated that all state purchased computers should have been put into labs. The department declined to pull all computers out of the classrooms because it will interrupt the instructional methodology, inevitably damage some of the computers, and interrupt classrooms six weeks in the spring and six weeks in the fall. One alternative is to bus children to the high school lab and rotate them through, look at opportunities for new grants, or use ICTL funds for testing methodologies. Discussion will continue with NWEA for alternatives, such as: using mobile laptop carts that can be rolled from classroom to classroom, Alpha Smarts, or possibly moving towards using Palm Pilots for all intense purposes.

It was announced that Senator Richardson would be rerunning again for the Senate seat representing District 32.

<u>Funding Formula Vote:</u> No motion was made on the funding formula.

<u>ICTL By Laws</u> will be brought to the full ICTL for clarification at the May 9th meeting. Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.